



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
11 SOUTH MERIDIAN
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204

COPY MAILED

SEP 03 2009

In re Patent No. 7,482,025	:	OFFICE OF PETITIONS
Stephen F. Badylak	:	DECISION ON
Issue Date: January 27, 2009	:	REQUEST FOR
Application No. 10/775,386	:	RECONSIDERATION OF
Filed: February 10, 2004	:	PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
Attorney Docket No. 3220-74469	:	

This is a decision on the "REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.705(d)," filed on March 27, 2009, requesting that the patent term adjustment determination for the above-identified patent be changed from five hundred fifty-five (555) days to one thousand eighty-two (1082) days.

The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment is **DISMISSED** with respect to making any change in the patent term adjustment determination under 35 U.S.C. § 154(b) of 555 days.

BACKGROUND

This application was filed on February 10, 2004. On September 26, 2008, the Office mailed a notice that the initial determination of patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) to date is 379 days¹. On January 27, 2009, the application matured into U.S. Patent No. 7,482,025, with a revised patent term adjustment of 555 days. The Office determined that 717 days of Office delay pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) and 37 CFR 1.702(b)^{2,3} overlaps with the 541 days of Office delay

¹ 541 days of Office delay was reduced by 162 days of applicant delay for a patent term adjustment of 379 days. No request for reconsideration of this initial determination was filed.

² Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 37 CFR 1.702(b) provides, in pertinent part, that:

Failure to issue a patent within three years of the actual filing date of the application. Subject to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 154(b) and this subpart, the term of an original patent shall be adjusted if the issuance of

pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) and 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1) and (a)(2)^{4,5} accorded prior to the issuance of the application. As such, 176 (717 - 541) additional days of patent term adjustment were entered at issuance under the three-year pendency provision. Given the applicant delay of 162 days, the patent issued with a revised patent term adjustment of 555 (541 + 176 - 162) days.

On March 27, 2009, patentee timely submitted this request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment (with required fee), asserting that the correct number of days of Patent Term Adjustment is 1082 days under the court's interpretation of the overlap provision as set forth in Wyeth v. Dudas, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. 2008). Patentee asserts that pursuant to Wyeth, a PTO delay under §154(b)(1)(A) overlaps

the patent was delayed due to the failure of the Office to issue a patent within three years after the date on which the application was filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) or the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application.

³ As of the issuance of the patent on January 27, 2009, the application was pending three years and 717 days.

⁴ 37 CFR § 1.702, provides grounds for adjustment of patent term due to examination delay under the Patent Term Guarantee Act of 1999 (original applications, other than designs, filed on or after May 29, 2000).

(a) Failure to take certain actions within specified time frames. Subject to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 154(b) and this subpart, the term of an original patent shall be adjusted if the issuance of the patent was delayed due to the failure of the Office to:

(1) Mail at least one of a notification under 35 U.S.C. 132 or a notice of allowance under 35 U.S.C. 151 not later than fourteen months after the date on which the application was filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) or fulfilled the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 371 in an international application;

(2) The number of days, if any, in the period beginning on the day after the date that is four months after the date a reply under § 1.111 was filed and ending on the date of mailing of either an action under 35 U.S.C. 132, or a notice of allowance under 35 U.S.C. 151, whichever occurs first;

⁵ A first Office action (restriction requirement) was not mailed until September 19, 2006, fourteen months and 527 days after the application filing date, February 10, 2004. A notice of allowance was not mailed until September 26, 2008, four (4) months and 14 days after the filing of a reply, filed on May 12, 2008, in response to a non-final office action.

with a delay under §154(b)(1)(B) only if the delays "occur on the same day." Patentee maintains that the 14 day period accorded pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a)(2) overlaps with the period under § 1.702(b). Patentee asserts that the total non-overlapping PTO delay under §154(b)(1)(A) & (B) is 1244 (541 + 717 - 14 overlap) days as these periods do not occur on the same day. Further, given the applicant delay of 162 days, patentee asserts entitlement to 1082 (1244 - 162) days of patent term adjustment.

OPINION

Patentee's interpretation of the period of overlap has been considered, but found inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of the overlap provision, 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

to the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f)*⁶ and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under

⁶ Likewise, 37 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See *Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule*, 65 Fed. Reg. 54366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See also *Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule*, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004). See also *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004).

Further, as stated in the *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the period during which the application was pending before the Office beginning on the

application filing date under 35 U.S.C. 111(a), February 10, 2004, and ending on the date of issuance of the patent, January 27, 2009 (not including any other periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)).

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) and 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1) and (a)(2), 541 (527 + 14) days of patent term adjustment were accorded during the pendency of the application. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) and 37 CFR 1.702(b), 717 days of patent term adjustment accrued for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application.

The 717 days of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(b) overlap with the 541 days of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(a). Entry of both the 717 days and the 541 days is neither permitted nor warranted. 717 days is the actual number of days issuance of the patent was delayed.

Accordingly, at issuance, the Office properly entered 176 days of adjustment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(b) for a total of the greater period of 717 days for Office delay.

CONCLUSION

In view thereof, the Office affirms that the revised determination of patent term adjustment at the time of the issuance of the patent is 555 days (717 days of Office delay - 162 days of applicant delay).

The Office acknowledges submission of the \$200.00 fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.18(e). No additional fees are required.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Douglas I. Wood, at (571) 272-3231.

Christina Pattee Donnell for

Anthony Knight
Supervisor
Office of Petitions